

Verdugo Wash Visioning RFP Questions and Answers

1 Public Engagement

- 1.1 *With regard to Deliverable B, specifically the “Consultant Meeting / Strategy Session Participation,” kindly describe the nature of these meetings / sessions in the current situation of limited travel / city lockdowns. If these are indeed carried out as virtual sessions / web-meetings, how are such sessions envisioned? Is it expected that the Consultant author / structure the format, or will the format be prescribed by the City of Glendale?*

As of now all meetings are planned to be held virtually, given current stay at home restrictions for most municipalities, and also out of respect for the health and well-being of the potentially selected firm and the City. Meetings with City staff are intended to review progress of the project. The City will refine the meeting schedule as part of the final scope of work. Each meeting would be anticipated to last between one and two hours.

- 1.2 *With regard to Deliverable B, specifically the “Public Hearings & Community Outreach,” kindly describe the expectations for the Consultant / level of effort in the preparation / participation of these public hearings. Is the Consultant expected to lead the preparation and/or organization efforts for these hearings? Is the Consultant expected to lead these public-hearing sessions in their entirety? Is the Consultant expected to craft a full community outreach plan, including activities, events, methods of outreach communication, strategies for engagement, etc.?*

- Preparation for public hearings and community outreach would primarily be related to developing the necessary graphics and narratives to present to the public, stakeholders, City Council, and other advisory committees. The consultant will be expected to provide raw graphics and narratives to be used in presentations to government entities typically via PowerPoint. If feasible given limitations on graphical presentations at virtual meetings, consultant would also be asked to assist in producing presentation panels or boards for online review by the general public.
- The consultant team will not be asked to lead public hearings. Currently all public hearings are held remotely (virtually), and the consultant would be expected to be virtually present to answer questions and provide supplemental information as part of staff presentations. The current virtual format used by the City is WebEx.
- The consultant will be asked to develop a schedule for virtual or (depending on the status of public safety orders) in-person, or a “visitation” format (where materials might be displayed outside for public viewing) for public outreach events. The schedule would identify critical points in the project development to solicit public feedback and opinion. Most of this would be conducted virtually and through a project website. The City has set aside funds for establishing a project website.
- The consultant will need to recommend strategies that could be used for public outreach (as suggested above), and provide the necessary graphics and narrative for outreach, which would be coordinated by City staff.

1.3 Do you anticipate the need to hold more than 2 public meetings as outlined in the RFP?

There will likely be a need for other public meetings with other boards, commissions, and stakeholders in addition to those already identified in the RFP. City staff will identify when these will be necessary and coordinate with the consultant team schedule, but the meetings will be led by city staff.

1.4 Has any community engagement work already been carried out around this project?

Specific events have not been executed yet. The Verdugo Wash is an element of the Bicycle Transportation Plan, adopted by City Council in 2012, which included public engagement, so the public is aware of the intentions of the wash and the route.

1.5 Will the City be providing translation services for community outreach materials and presentations or will this be required by the consultant?

The City can provide translation services. It should be noted that the availability for translation will be dependent on other projects and City outreach demands.

1.6 Will the City be able to provide mailing lists (physical address and email addresses) for constituents along the Verdugo Wash and other relevant parties for community outreach?

The City can provide mailing lists for physical address. Some email addresses have been collected for key stakeholders, but as part of initial public outreach the City will create an interested parties list, including email addresses.

1.7 As we prepare our scope document, should we specify in person vs. virtual meeting, or is that something the awarded team can work out as the COVID-19 situation settles down?

Yes. The City is currently using and plans to use virtual outreach meetings, therefore meetings should be approached that way. The selected consultant team and City can modify the strategy if conditions change.

1.8 For community outreach sessions – would it be prudent to show our virtual community outreach session collateral assuming there will be a lingering influence of COVID-19 in 2021?

All strategies of public engagement that exhibit creativity and adaptability to current conditions would be helpful in assessing a consultant team's experience with community engagement.

2 Stakeholder Engagement

- 2.1 *Will the planning process include preliminary vetting of concepts or coordination with state and federal permitting agencies (Army Corps, CDWF, etc.)?*

Yes, the consultant team will be expected to coordinate with key stakeholders as outlined in the RFP including, but not limited to, the Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles.

- 2.2 *The RFP makes limited reference to the US Corp of Engineers and the LA County Flood Control District and flood control requirements that will be significant driver in the vision planning process. The Upper River Revitalization Plan for Verdugo wash didn't propose significant modifications to the channel (in most segments) to provide public access, greening or habitat improvements. We expect that this is related to channel hydrology and other constraints. Has the City coordinated with those Agencies in the preparation of the RFP and if so, can you elaborate on their expected involvement in the visioning process?*

The consultant team will be expected to coordinate with the agencies listed in the RFP, including the Army Corps of Engineers and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The project has been identified in the Bicycle Transportation Plan since 2012. Outreach, engagement, and coordination will be an essential function of the scope of work, and the visioning process will assist in establishing concepts and ideas to bring forth and coordinate with the respective stakeholders and agencies.

- 2.3 *Is the City planning to form a technical advisory committee to aggregate and streamline input and consultation with key stakeholders?*

Yes, the city intends to form a technical advisory committee as part of the public engagement process.

3 Submittal Structure and Insurance Forms

- 3.1 *Page 22 qualification and technical proposal does not provide the preferred location of the forms. - Where would you like the forms included? As an appendix?*

The City would ask that these forms be included as an appendix to the submittal.

- 3.2 *Are the forms excluded from the total page count/50 pages?*

Yes, these forms would be excluded from the total 50 pages of the submittal. The forms may be attached as a separate exhibit or appendix to the RFP.

- 3.3 *Do subconsultants need to complete the following standard forms referenced in Exhibit 2*

- *Form C – Restrictions on Lobbying and Contacts*

- *Form D – Statement of Qualifications*
- *Form E – Proposer's Affidavit of Noncollusion*
- *Form F – Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Statement*
- *Form G – Hold Harmless Agreement*
- *Form H – Insurance Requirements Affidavit*
- *Disclosure – Campaign Finance Ordinance*

No, only the prime/lead consultant needs to provide forms D and the Disclosure – Campaign Finance Ordinance.

3.4 Do subconsultants need to provide this - Information Regarding Debarments, Defaults, Claims, And Related Events (Page 21 part D)

Yes, all members of the consultant team should provide this information.

3.5 It appears that form H is not the appropriate Insurance Requirement Affidavit.

Correct. The City did include form H, which is the incorrect form. This form will not be required as part of the submittal.

3.6 What is the format of our submission including required forms, proof of insurance and other required documentation?

The submission should be in digital format and submitted prior to September 9, 2020, 5 pm (PST). The submission should be emailed as a PDF or as a share link (Dropbox, OneDrive, etc.). This should be emailed to bcalvert@glendaleca.gov. All required forms can be included as an appendix to the submission and does not count towards the 50-page limit. The structure should follow page 22 of the RFP, and the documents as required on page 21 should be included as an appendix.

3.7 On page 3, Paragraph B, states the "deadline for receiving proposals...is August 11, 2020." Please clarify.

This date is incorrect. The deadline for receiving proposals is September 9, 2020. 5 pm (PST).

3.8 Do you anticipate an extension to the submission deadline?

We currently do not anticipate an extension to the submission deadline.

3.9 Can the Business Automobile insurance requirement be satisfied by an Umbrella Liability policy?

Yes.

3.10 *We would like to propose changes to the Insurance Requirements Affidavit – are these acceptable to the City of Glendale?*

Any proposed changes to the City’s standard insurance requirements or hold harmless agreement must be part of the RFP response. If a proposer cannot meet the City’s minimum insurance requirements that may be a basis for disqualification. That being said, some minor modifications may be acceptable and would be finalized prior to execution of a contract and final scope of work.

3.11 *Under General Requirements of Exhibit D, Insurance Requirements to PSA, we find sections 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 to be overly broad and unfavorable to the Consultant. Are these terms negotiable?*

See Response 3.10.

3.12 *We would like to propose changes to Form G, Hold Harmless Agreement – are these acceptable to the City of Glendale?*

3.13 *See Response 3.10. Form H specifies “Mobile Cart Food and Beverage Services” – will you please send an updated form for The Verdugo Wash Visioning project?*

This form was incorrectly included in the packet, and does not need to be provided as part of the submittal response.

3.14 *Would it be acceptable to use the proposal structure below? This would allow the items listed on page 21 to be integrated as a separate section. If this is not acceptable, will you please let us know how you would prefer the items on page 21 be included?*

Introduction (Cover Letter)

- A. Background, Affirmations, Certifications & Stability (items listed on page 21)*
- B. Qualifications*
- C. Project Team*
- D. Experience*
- E. Project Schedule*
- F. Cost Summary*
- G. References*

The items from page 21 should be included as an appendix, while maintaining the proposal structure outlined on page 22 of the RFP.

3.15 *Would the City be willing to consider any requested changes to the City of Glendale PSA and Exhibit 2 Form G? If so, how would you like for us to present those requests in the proposal?*

All responses to the RFP shall indicate any changes the proposer seeks to make to the City’s PSA and Exhibit 2 Form G. The proposed changes may be shown in a narrative format referencing each PSA or Form G section chronologically, or in a redline.

3.16 *Kindly confirm if the items listed on page 18 of the RFP as part of the section titled “Submittal Requirements”, such as the review of the PSA and the sample insurance certificate (Exhibit D/ Exhibit 1) are required to be submitted with the RFP response. If yes, are these to be counted towards / included in the 50-page limit?*

Yes, proposer review and comment/questions on the City’s PSA and insurance requirements must be included with the submittal package, but are not included in the 50-page limit.

3.17 *Kindly confirm if the information listed in page 21 of the RFP, as part of the section titled “Background, Affirmations, Certifications & Stability” are required to be submitted with the RFP response. If yes, are these to be counted towards / included in the 50-page limit?*

Yes, these documents should be included in the submittal package, but are not included in the 50-page limit.

3.18 *It is our understanding that the information listed on page 22 of the RFP, as part of the section titled “Qualifications and Technical Proposal” are to not exceed 50-pages total. Kindly confirm.*

That is correct.

4 Project Scope, Phasing, and Implementation

4.1 *Will there be additional phases to the project?*

Yes. The expectation is that following a successful completion of the visioning portion of the project, additional phases will be needed for environmental review, project approval and implementation. As highlighted in the scope, the City would like to identify early implementation strategies that could begin advancing the project engineering, and final design leading to environmental review and approval.

4.2 *Are we to have a more detailed scope of work developed upon team selection or at proposal submission?*

A more detailed scope of work will be developed upon team selection and prior to entering into a contract with the selected consultant team, and agreed upon by all parties.

4.3 *How great a role will feasibility/implementation play in the scope of work outlined for this RFP?*

The City intends for the scope of work to facilitate the development of a highly creative and transformative vision. Simultaneously, the City intends for the vision to lead to future phases of the project, such as a feasibility analysis, and various stages of implementation.

4.4 *How detailed is the expectation around engineering, feasibility, hydrology, ecology, etc?*

The Verdugo Wash Visioning intends to serve as the first phase of development of a design and strategies for the wash. As such, the initial phase is not expected to provide a

detailed analysis on engineering, feasibility, hydrology, ecology. It should take into account each of these elements, and create a vision that can be implemented and further analyzed through subsequent design phases.

- 4.5 *Does the scope of the project include any work within the concrete channel itself, or only in the quarter-mile study area shown on the plan on page 12.*

The purpose of the visioning study is to identify the appropriate configuration for a linear park along the path of the Verdugo wash. It will be the role of the consultant to recommend if there are segments that should be within the channel, above (capping) the channel, or adjacent to the channel.

- 4.6 *Upon review of the August 8, 2020 Outlook Newspaper article 'City Council Deems Bike Trail Proposal Worth Studying' you mention there will likely be a 'bite sized approach' to accomplishing the urban design vision for Verdugo Wash. Do you have any priority projects in mind, or a schedule / phasing strategy that you feel is a higher priority at this time?*

Priorities would be defined through the visioning process, particularly when identifying strategies that could be implemented early. As the vision is developed, the City staff and consultant team would identify short, mid, and long term implementation strategies.

- 4.7 *To what extent will the consultant be responsible for evaluating the feasibility of crossings (at-grade, below, or above grade) at the 25-30 crossings in the corridor?*

The consultant will identify strategic locations where crossings may be appropriately considered, or where it might be feasible to cap portions of the wash to create open space areas. The existing crossings should be considered as fixed, and opportunities to integrate and interface with them will be important to provide access and continuity to the overall vision and design.

- 4.8 *The scope of work and deliverables defined in the RFP, far exceed the available funding. Will the City accept proposals that make significant modifications to the scope as required to align it with available funding, and deem them responsive?*

The City will accept modified proposals based on fee and scope. The City has also identified likely additional funding opportunities to potentially increase scope and funding.

5 Team Composition

- 5.1 *Can you please confirm if it is permissible to both prime a team in response to the Verdugo Wash RFP and simultaneously be a consultant on another team?*

Yes, it is permissible for a team to respond on multiple applications as a prime or a subconsultant.

- 5.2 *What subconsultants are expected to be included in the proposed teams? Are there specific goals/guidelines around how scope and responsibilities are expected to be divided?*

All anticipated subconsultants should be included in the proposed teams based upon the skills and expertise of each firm. The project considers public open space, urban design, mobility, sustainability, and engineering. As such, a full team should provide expertise and experience with each. Depending on the expertise of the firm, that may require additional subconsultants, or several of the tasks may be led by a smaller number of firms or the prime consultant.

- 5.3 *Is there a possibility to add sub-consultants after the project has been awarded?*

It is possible, but would require an amendment to the contract. It is recommended that the team presented, serve as the anticipated team for this phase of the project.

6 Selection Committee and City Project Team

- 6.1 *Who is on the selection panel and what department do they reside in?*

The selection committee will be made up of members from Planning, Urban Design, Mobility, Parks & Community Services, and Public Works.

- 6.2 *Who will be on the project leadership team?*

The team will be led by Planning and Urban Design, with support from Parks & Community Services, Mobility, and Public Works.

- 6.3 *What expertise can City staff contribute to the study (public outreach, GIS, public works, etc.)?*

City staff can provide support for mapping, GIS, land use data, urban design, planning, land use, and public outreach. As highlighted in question number two, outreach is expected to be conducted online, and primarily led by city staff, relying on the consultant team to provide resources and ideas for engagement strategies.

- 6.4 *How will the evaluation committee weigh experience in built work vs. visioning/conceptual work experience?*

The City would like to have a degree of certainty that the vision created for the Verdugo Wash will be a vision that can be advanced to implementation. Simultaneously, the City does recognize that the projects each consultant team may use as examples are often long-term visions that may occur in various stages of implementation. As such, consultant teams should include detailed information for conceptual projects and where they are in the process of becoming implemented.

- 6.5 *Because there is not a pre-bid meeting with a sign in sheet, can the firm names of all companies that have submitted questions be shared?*

The City will not be sharing the names of firms that have asked questions.

7 Existing Information and Data Availability

- 7.1 *Has the City or other jurisdictions conducted technical reports or studies regarding the life space of the Verdugo Wash structure, hydrology, etc. which the team will have access to?*

There are no technical reports at this time. During the visioning process the City and consultant team will identify when these reports and studies will be necessary for next steps.

- 7.2 *Have other feasibility studies already been carried out, or is the city planning to do one concurrently/following visioning?*

There are no current feasibility studies. Following the visioning process, additional studies will be conducted including feasibility, pre-engineering, and environmental.

- 7.3 *Is there existing traffic/transportation analysis and data available for streets adjacent to, intersecting, and/or around the study area?*

Yes, there is existing data that the City will provide the consultant, as part of the consultant team's initial data request, once the final scope of work has been developed and a contract has been awarded.

- 7.4 *Does bicycle and pedestrian count information exist in the communities adjacent to the Wash? If no, is there a need to accommodate count data collection in the project budget?*

Citywide bicycle and pedestrian counts were completed in 2017 and 2019 and will be available to the selected consultant team.

- 7.5 *The Verdugo Wash Existing Conditions diagram on page 15 of the RFP maps out 9 cross sections in the map, yet I am not sure what this notation points to. I assume it is related to the Characteristics Images provided on page 16. We would appreciate your confirmation either way.*

Correct, the notations reference the Characteristic Images to provide a current conditions overview. The images provided do not represent all of the indicated section cuts.

- 7.6 *Section B.1 of the scope of work notes that the City will provide all available background and existing conditions information. Could you provide a list of the information that will be made available? Of particular interest, beyond standard base mapping information is:*

- Detailed topography (e.g. 1' contours)*
- 3D structures / massing*

- *Hydrology and hydraulic studies (providing flood elevations and velocities for various events)*
- *Traffic and mobility data*

The City will be able to provide data regarding traffic and mobility, topography maps, some 3-D massing models, and other data. A full list would be developed based upon the consultant teams request following award of the contract.

7.7 Does the City have traffic data of adjacent streets along the Verdugo Wash?

Yes, the City does have traffic data that will be provided as part of the initial data request by the selected consultant team upon completion of contracting.

8 Relationship to Other Projects

8.1 How will this project tie into the on-going LA County Master Plan?

The project is expected to coordinate and develop a logical connection with the Los Angeles River Project. The consultant team will be expected to coordinate with Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles as the vision is developed.

8.2 Has the concept of a Verdugo Wash path and/or linear park been referenced in past Glendale planning documents?

Yes, the Verdugo Wash is a long range project referenced in the Bicycle Transportation Plan, and seen as a key route as part of the multi-modal network.